DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 687 AC 005 409

Higher Education and Community Service. Third Annual Report.
National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Mar 69
Note-34p.
Available from-Supt. of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 344-845 (2100)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-*Adult Education Programs, City Problems, Colleges, Community Organizations, *Community Service Programs, Federal Aid, Federal Legislation, *Federal Programs, Government Role, *Program Evaluation, State Federal Support, Universities, *University Extension
Identifiers-Community Service and Continuing Education Program, Higher Education Act of 1965 Title I

The National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education was established under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 for the purposes of giving advice to the Community Service and Continuing Education Program and reviewing the administration and effectiveness of all Federally supported extension and continuing education programs. This third annual report of the Council reviews the administration of the Community Service Program; summarizes the National Council's study of the total Federal effort in supporting adult education; and presents recommendations. It is reported that the Community Service Program has encouraged State and local officials to join with colleges, universities, and community leaders in making significant contributions to the solution of community problems. The lack of staff and funds, however, has delayed the accomplishment of the National Advisory Council's responsibility to evaluate all federally supported extension and continuing education programs. Among recommendations from the Council are: that it be provided with a full-time director and other personnel and funds needed to fulfill its responsibility and that Congress study the indirect cost rates for all federally supported extension and continuing education programs in order to establish a consistent fiscal policy. (se)

EDO 316687

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION

GHER EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education

March 1969

AC005409

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION

AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

March 31, 1969

Dear Mr. President:

On behalf of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, as authorized by Public Law 89-329, I am privileged as Chairman to submit to you the Third Annual Report of the Council.

The Council was created by Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to advise the Commissioner of Education on program administration and to review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs.

The report contains five recommendations which the Council believes will strengthen extension and continuing education programs in higher education.

The Council members are prepared to discuss their findings and recommendations further with anyone you may designate.

Respectfully yours,

Peter P. Muirhead
Acting U.S. Commissioner
of Education

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

March 31, 1969

Dear Mr. Secretary:

On behalf of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, as authorized by Public Law 89-329, I am privileged as Chairman to submit to you the Third Annual Report of the Council.

The Council was created by Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to advise the Commissioner of Education on program administration and to review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs.

This report describes the current Community Service and Continuing Education Program, and sets forth the Council's efforts to carry out its responsibilities. The report also contains five recommendations which the Council believes will strengthen extension and continuing education programs across the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

Peter P. Muirhead
Acting U.S. Commissioner
of Education

Honorable Robert H. Finch
Secretary of Health, Education,
and Welfare
Washington, D.C.

THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

Peter P. Muirhead, Acting U.S. Commissioner of Education
Chairman

Honorable Joseph Alioto
Mayor of San Francisco
San Francisco, California

Dr. Dorothy M. Ford
Consultant, Business and
Distributive Education
Office of Superintendent of
Schools
Los Angeles, California

Rev. William P. Haas
President
Providence College
Providence, Rhode Island

Dr. Fred H. Harrington
President
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Mr. Patrick Healy
Executive Director
National League of Cities
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Cyril O. Houle
Professor of Education
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Dr. John Hove
Chairman, Department of English
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota 58102

Mr. Jesse C. Kellam
Member Board of Regents
Texas State Senior Colleges
Austin, Texas

Dr. Edward L. Keller
Vice President
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Mr. Francisco D. Sanchez, Jr.
Coordinator, Office of New Programs
Albuquerque Public Schools
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dr. Thurman J. White
Vice President for Special Projects
The University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Mrs. Aminda B. Wilkins
Director of Community Relations
New York City Department of Welfare
New York, New York

One representative each from the Department of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Labor, Interior, State, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, and Transportation, as well as of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Small Business Administration.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COUNCIL 5

A REPORT ON COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS 8

Significant Achievements Since 1966 9

The Community Service and Continuing Education Program--Fiscal Year 1968 11

Conclusion 15

A REVIEW OF FEDERALLY-SUPPORTED EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION 16

Review of Administration and Effectiveness 17

The Federal Role in Continuing Education 18

Conclusion 19

APPENDIX 20

Introduction

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is a complex piece of legislation whose passage crowned a quarter-century of Congressional activity.

The urgent desire of both Executive and Legislative branches to solve those problems of urbanized America which might respond to educational programs designed for the adult decision-makers of society culminated in the enactment of Title I. To this end, Title I provided for a Community Service and Continuing Education Program "for the purpose of assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use."

Both the President and the members of Congress had a number of prototypes in mind as they drafted this legislation but perhaps the chief model for the new Program was the Agricultural Extension Service which, in half a century's work, had reshaped the rural life and economy of the nation. But while Title I had a parallel purpose to the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 which created that Service, it adopted radically different means. Three changes were particularly crucial. The new Act did not provide for a stable and enduring structure to deal with continuing and emerging needs on a long-range basis, but placed its focus on the handling of specific and immediate problems. It did not concentrate authority in the hands of a single university in a State, but sought to involve all its institutions of higher education. It did not allocate primary authority for administration to the institutions themselves but required the designation of a State agency which either had the broad competence to solve community problems itself or which would enlist the aid of a special advisory committee for that purpose.

As this new Program was being shaped in Congress, a viewpoint which had often been expressed in the past gained new adherents. During the debates in committee and on the floor in both houses, it became clear that many Federal programs already supported adult education carried out by universities and other agencies, and that other new programs of the same sort were constantly being created. These various services were scattered throughout the government but were particularly evident in the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Labor, Justice, Transportation, Interior, State, and Housing and Urban Development, as well as in the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Small Business Administration. The Bureau of the Budget, other Executive agencies, and some members of Congress had long been troubled by the proliferation of these services; now Congress and the President realized and forcefully expressed the need for greater coordination.

The Act therefore established a National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education with official representation from the before-mentioned Departments and with twelve public members appointed by the President. This Council was designed to have two functions. First, it was required to give advice on the operation of Title I's own Program. Second, it was charged to "review the administration and effectiveness of all Federally supported extension and continuing education programs, including community service programs."

This third annual report of the Advisory Council therefore falls naturally into three parts: a review of the administration of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program itself; an account of the Council's attempt to carry out the Congressional mandate to review the total Federal effort; and a presentation of the recommendations which the Council wishes to make to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the President, and to the Congress. In the following report, the Recommendations are placed first for convenience. While the other two sections provide the basic data, the Advisory Council wishes in the rest of this Introduction to express its viewpoint concerning the year's accomplishments.

As to the first function, the Council feels a sense of satisfaction in the growth and maturation of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program. Much has been achieved by the staffs of the Office of Education and the State agencies despite the limited funds available to them. Congress authorized $50 million for the year 1968, but actually appropriated only $10 million. This restriction of resources severely cramped the development of the Program but the evidence indicates that the money actually provided was, on the whole, spent prudently and well. A major program of this sort takes a number of years to establish itself and to perfect its patterns of administration, and this task is made all the harder if ends and means are outlandishly disproportionate. During the third year of its operation, however, the Program has made significant quantitative progress. All but one of the States and Territories have active programs, forty-eight State advisory committees are at work, the number of people served has doubled since last year, and more institutions are involved than previously took part.

Equally important, the Program has improved qualitatively. More remains to be done and the Advisory Council would like to commission a thoroughgoing independent evaluation of the Program to find points where further improvements could be made. Even with available data, however, it is evident that much has been accomplished. The Program has built on past successes, it has reshaped activities to have greater impact, and it has strengthened administrative processes. As more money becomes available, it can be spent economically in terms of tested policies and procedures.

On the other hand, the Advisory Council cannot be happy with its capacity to discharge its second function, the study of the whole pattern of Federal adult education. As later pages will show, modest efforts have been put forth and a few useful tasks have been accomplished. But the Council has never been given any staff resources to help it with its work and, in this third year of its life, it has no funds to engage professional personnel, to commission studies, to hold conferences, or to make those analyses which are essential "to review the administration and effectiveness of the Federal programs." To perform this task, the Council requires a staff accountable to it and not to the administrators of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program, which itself is one of the Federal services which requires independent review and appraisal. It is manifestly wrong to require service of the Council but then to deny it the resources it must have to perform that service.

Every day brings fresh evidence that the President and Congress were right in believing that the service itself is an essential one. The Federal government has no central policy concerning adult education other than to include it as a primary or secondary function in achieving countless other goals. In 1960, a study undertaken by the Library of Congress indicated that there were than 350 educational programs (in thirty-seven major units of government) whose primary clients were adults; an analysis of the 1968 Quattlebaum Study would probably show that the number has substantially increased.

The Advisory Council has come to feel very keenly that the present lack of coordination leads to many ills. Government decision makers and administrators have no clear conception of the nature and dimensions of Federal adult education. Gaps and duplications of service undoubtedly exist. The mutual facilitation of similar programs does not always occur, and open competition is sometimes found. Conflicting policies and procedures are followed, so that the government speaks to the people themselves, to State governments, and to local authorities with a babble of contradictory voices. Such problems as these were evident to the President and the Congress at the time the Advisory Council was created; they are even more acute now. Meanwhile, because the Council has no resources it is virtually helpless to begin the task of seeking even modest remedies for the problems so apparent to it.

While the two functions of the Council can be distinguished from one another and each has its distinctive values, the two are closely interrelated in practice. The Program has been enriched by the ideas of the governmental members of this Council and they, in turn, have found ways to relate some of their own substantive endeavors to it. The State agencies, in their State plans, have drawn upon the wisdom gained from earlier experience with other programs; and the effort to

create mechanisms and staffs to administer the Program effectively at the State level sets up channels for future coordination. The Program makes modestly possible the building of continuing staffs (in the Federal Government, in the States, and in the universities) which are not bound by specific program emphases but may shape their activities to meet pressing needs, thereby moving away from the narrowness of viewpoint which may result from the sharpness of focus of virtually every other Federal program.

Without the Program, the Council would be like a balloon which has slipped its moorings and might well go drifting off into the blue, unrelated in any way to the realities of life below. Without the mandate to study Federal activities broadly, the Council might dwindle into another special interest group, jealously protecting its own appropriation. The Council hopes that it will not fall prey to either danger.

In a democratic society, one of the major ways both to reinforce enduring values and institutions and to deal with present or emerging problems is to help adult citizens understand how to improve the quality of life. The programs established by Congress or by the Executive branch have diverse purposes, countless clienteles, and myriad ways of work, but all express the same basic function: to use the educative process to help adult Americans fulfill their own potential and that of the nation.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COUNCIL

On the basis of reports reviewed and its deliberations, the Council recommends:

1. THAT $25 MILLION BE APPROPRIATED FOR TITLE I, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, TO INCREASE THE PRESENT LEVEL OF STATE PLAN OPERATIONS WITH UP TO TWO PERCENT OF THE APPROPRIATION EARMARKED FOR A NATIONWIDE EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM AND DISSEMINATION OF EXEMPLARY INSTITUTIONAL PROJECTS.

After three years of experience it is clear that a national system of community serving agencies and programs has been developed and that these funds can be effectively used in the State grant program. The Council also believes that a national evaluation of the program is essential for future planning and operations at State and national levels. Such a study would be of service to the Congress in its review of this Federal grant-in-aid program as suggested in Title VI, Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968.

2. THAT AN ADDITIONAL $25 MILLION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS OF RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IN MAJOR METROPOLITAN AREAS BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION FOR GRANTS TO INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS OR COMBINATIONS OF INSTITUTIONS.

The experience under Title I illustrates that the politics of distribution militates against the concentration of funds in the cities and that adherence to State boundaries frequently by-passes the needs of metropolitan areas. This new legislative authority is required to assist higher education in moving from a project orientation to a sustained commitment to urban problem solving. A basic need is appropriate and adequately staffed organizational arrangements for the development and application of higher education resources to the problems of the cities.

3. THAT THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE PROVIDE THE COUNCIL WITH A FULL-TIME DIRECTOR AND OTHER PERSONNEL AND FUNDS AS ARE NECESSARY TO CARRY OUT ITS ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITY.

An adequate staff and budget are necessary to carry out the task of reviewing and recommending with respect to "...all Federally supported extension and continuing education programs." Neither the Council or its staff should serve as an advocate for any single agency, program or constituency in the area of extension and continuing education.

In the best judgment of the Council the requirement is an annual budget of $140,000. Funds for FY 1970 should be made available on July 1, 1969.

4. THAT APPROPRIATIONS FOR TITLE I AND OTHER UNIVERSITY BASED CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS BE INCLUDED IN THE APPROPRIATION ACT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR PRECEDING THAT FOR WHICH SUCH FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FOR OBLIGATIONS.

The Council urges the President and Congress to make earlier appropriations for educational programs.

Higher education institutions must rely on a more predictable basis for Federal support in order to maintain commitment to on-going programs. Sudden increases or decreases in funding make a mockery of planning and are wasteful of money and manpower.

5. THAT THE CONGRESS DIRECT THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE TO STUDY THE INDIRECT COST RATES FOR ALL FEDERALLY SUPPORTED EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN ORDER THAT A CONSISTENT FISCAL POLICY MAY BE ESTABLISHED.

In its last report the Council recommended that a thorough study be made of the various approaches to the problem of overhead or indirect costs reimbursement for Federally supported extension and continuing education programs. The Council again recommends that the General Accounting Office may be the appropriate agency to prepare a report as the basis for Congressional action.

A REPORT ON

COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

PROGRAMS

UNDER

TITLE I, THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

This section of the Council's report summarizes (1) the accomplishments of Title I since the program began in 1966 and (2) the activities of Title I during the fiscal year 1968.

SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENTS SINCE 1966

There are now 53 Title I agencies, one in every State of the Union (except Indiana), the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the overseas territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands. More than half of the agencies have a full-time professional administrator, and in some States two professionals are employed. A few States have yet to provide for the services of a full-time professional for the important tasks of planning and administration.

Forty-eight statewide advisory councils have been established. The 676 council members include educators, State and local government officials, leaders from business, industry and civic groups, and representatives of community action agencies. State councils identify critical problems in their States, suggest priorities, and advise State administrators on the appropriateness of projects proposed by colleges and universities. The expertise of educational and public leaders are therefore joined in an effort to develop viable State plans for community service and continuing education.

The States report that 5,000 individual units of State and local government, community organizations, and agencies have cooperated with colleges and universities in carrying out community service programs. Since 1966 over 300 institutions of higher education have participated annually. Some, such as State universities, had vast previous experience in conducting community service programs; under Title I they broadened the scope of their operation. Community colleges and smaller public and private universities have started to offer new programs, pragmatically organized to cope with community problems. The development of new patterns of cooperation among higher education institutions, local governments, and community agencies is a major contribution of the Title I program.

State Plans and Programs

With the advent of this program, new attention was directed to statewide planning for community services and continuing education programs. State plans are characterized by a problem-oriented approach in their development. Since each State has devised its own methods for gathering information and making decisions, the plans vary in the selection of problems and in determination of priorities.

Colleges and universities have responded to the needs of their States with more proposals than could be funded. The States report that approximately $40 million could be effectively used in fiscal year 1970.

While the Council believes that the projects undertaken have been relevant to community needs, meeting the objective of a statewide system of community service programs is not possible without increased funding and the assurance of continuing Federal support. Few institutions are able to make long-term commitments such as creating urban affairs centers, developing multi-discipline programs or experimenting with new approaches to community services without assurance of Federal support.

Title I has encouraged some States to increase financial support for community services and continuing education. For example, Virginia and West Virginia now meet their matching requirements for Title I through State appropriations, and Connecticut has a $200,000 State appropriation for the 1967-69 biennium. A number of State agencies have made formal requests to their Legislatures for matching funds, and several others are planning to do so. In these first three years, $17 million have been provided from State, local, and institutional sources to match the Federal appropriations.

Several States also reported that Title I has made a modest impact on the curriculum -- undergraduate and graduate programs have been developed and courses have been added at some institutions. The Council notes that in Massachusetts, this program is considered wholly responsible for the establishment of an A.M. degree in urban affairs at Boston University. The School of Government and Public Administration at the American University in the District of Columbia employed two new faculty members, making it possible to offer a master's degree in urban affairs. Support for a new master's degree program in public administration at Ohio State University is attributed to a statewide program conducted by the University on management improvement of State government officials.

State reports also indicate that Title I has made a modest but significant contribution to the literature on community problems. "Social Unrest, Crime, and Delinquency" and "The Agony of the Inner-City--What Can Continuing Education Do?" published in Maryland; "School Boards and School Board Problems--A Clinical Approach," in Wisconsin; and "Urban Exploration," in Florida are examples. Others include Maryland's "Beautification Program for Small Communities in Maryland, Kentucky's "Exploring the Generation Gap in Louisville," Iowa's "Union Leadership Communication Skills," Texas' "Solid Waste in Urban Environment," and the Virgin Island's "Alien-Temporary Workers in a Permanent Economy." Others are publications with a broader clientele, such as "Interaction," a Miami, Florida, quarterly that includes research papers on community development, articles on urban problems, exchanges of agency information relating to problems of housing, education, and unemployment.

THE COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EUDCATION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1968

A total of 719 problem-solving projects were initiated by 429 colleges and universities in Fiscal Year 1968. These programs ranged from helping Cuban refugees adjust to their new environment in Florida to sensitizing government personnel to the problems and the needs of central city residents in Milwaukee. They included community leadership training for black leaders in the "inner cities" of Baltimore, Tulsa, and Los Angeles. Seminars and workshops were held for newly-elected Board of Education members in Maine and Georgia, newly-elected mayors and city councilmen in Iowa and Oregon, and new State legislators in West Virginia and Ohio. The Nation's colleges and universities directed their educational resources to some 13 State-designated problem areas with particular emphasis on urban and suburban locations.

With the organization of additional advisory groups in Delaware, Minnesota, Texas and Wyoming, there are now 676 persons actively engaged in planning state programs.

The States reported that the number of people served by the program rose from 425,000 to 833,000. In addition an estimated 800,000 persons were reached by television and radio in 15 States.

The States provided $10.1 million to match the $9.6 million in federal funds for the support of college community efforts to solve pressing problems in housing, government, human relations, and economic development.

Participating Colleges and Universities

A total of 429 institutions of higher education participated in the development and operation of projects funded during this year. Tax-supported colleges and universities received the major share of Federal funds (79.9%) and administered the largest number of programs.

Public and private institutions continued to combine resources of faculty and facilities in cooperative efforts to improve community service programs. A comparison of distribution of Federal funds by type of institution appears in the appendix (Table I).

Cooperating Community Organizations

In developing and carrying out community service programs, the institutions of higher education engaged the cooperation of State and local governmental agencies, professional and civic groups, business and other community organizations. The States reported that about 2,500 groups and organizations participated in planning and operating the 719 programs in Fiscal Year 1968, compared to 1,527 groups and institutions in 602 programs in FY 1967. (See Appendix, Table VI for a state-by-state comparison.)

Emphasis on Urban Problems

A major portion of the projects were directed to the problems of urban and suburban areas of the country. A total of 376 projects (52%) were in urban areas. Other projects conducted in suburban areas and on a statewide basis were frequently directed to America's cities.

The States initiated 19 projects that were directly linked with Model Cities in 22 communities across the country. Illustrative projects were Princeton University's program on technical assistance, education, and training for community leaders in Trenton, Hoboken, and Newark; Fresno State College's management training project for Fresno businessmen; drop-out and other youth programs in Dade County-Miami and in East St. Louis. Leadership training was developed for Model Cities area residents in New York City, Minneapolis, Texarkana, Des Moines, and Denver. The technical assistance programs in Portland, Tulsa, Seattle, and Tacoma brought university faculty assistance to residents and officials alike in immediate problems of housing and education.

In towns and cities across the country, projects dealt with the problems of poverty, racism, and other aspects of human relations, poor ghetto leadership, youth opportunities, housing, land use, and the improvement of government operations and administration.

Rural oriented projects numbered 65 (9%) in 1968. These programs were aimed generally at cultural, political, and economic development of the rural areas of the States. Typical of these were the Humboldt State College in California and the University of California at Berkeley projects which established a center for community development to work with land use planning, economic development, and cultural enrichment in the isolated counties of northern California. Eastern Kentucky University sought to improve political leadership in rural areas through a series of seminars on the services of local government.

One hundred and eighty-nine programs, (26%) were regional or statewide in scope. Illustrative projects were: a seminar on the subculture of poverty for voluntary social workers and community leaders in the 13 parishes that comprise Southwestern Louisiana; and a statewide project of workshops and training programs in citizen leadership in the Virgin Islands. To provide physicians and para-medical personnel with current information and new techniques, the Medical College of Virginia has combined TV instruction with seminars in 20 communities across the state. (See Appendix, Table II for the distribution of projects and Federal funds in terms of geographic area served.)

The Problem Areas

The legislation suggests a number of broad areas of concern toward which state efforts are directed: housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health and land use. State planning has added new categories of concern. These include such problems as community and economic development, human relations, and personal development.

Individual projects have been analyzed in terms of their relation to the problem areas identified by the States. (See Appendix, Table VII for a comparison of number of programs by problem area.)

Local government operation was established as a priority problem in 46 States. State agencies allocated about one third of their financial resources to 277 projects (32%) in 1968. Texas concentrated its entire effort on the "problem of urban local governmental affairs." Some illustrative projects are the Oklahoma City Municipal Employees Training Center sponsored by five universities to assist and improve the municipal government performance in the Oklahoma City metropolitan area and the "Universities Community Educational Services for Metropolitan Areas" conducted by Marquette University and six other institutions to assist government officials in meeting the needs of central city residents in Milwaukee. The management development program for top administrative personnel of Minnesota's State Government was adapted from a similar one in Ohio. Conferences and institutes for legislators, City Councilmen and school board members were conducted in several States.

In 46 States there were 173 Community Development projects (24%) aimed at informing citizens of the broad range of community problems, and increasing the capacities of community leaders and other adults to manage their own affairs and improve their lot through "self-help" methods.

Characteristic of the wide variety of programs in this problem area are the following examples: Georgia State conducted a workshop for adult educators to develop leadership among the poverty groups; and Southern Illinois University provided a community development service for low income citizens' organizations. A State-wide community development program was established in California on nine campuses of the State University.

The other problem areas combined made up 44 percent of the total number of projects in 1968. Personal Development programs designed to aid individual growth and to increase responsible citizenship accounted for 35 projects. Youth opportunities was the focus of 43 programs. Thirty one projects dealt with human relations aimed at alleviating racial tensions and other conflicts in the urban area. Land use projects totaled 43, the majority of which were conducted in the inner cities of metropolitan areas.

The Council notes that an ambitious land use project took place in California where San Diego State College worked with public officials and private agencies in coordinated planning of the physical growth of metropolitan San Diego.

There were 37 recreation programs in 1968. Noteworthy activities are the University of Iowa's program to assist in the growth and development of community theater groups, and Eastern Kentucky University's training of subprofessional and volunteer recreational personnel to improve community recreation services.

Sixty health programs were organized across the States. Projects included a seminar series in medical technology and efforts to improve dietary services in nursing homes.

Seventeen programs were directed to the economic development of communities. These programs sought to influence the pattern of business and industrial growth in Eastern Montana through workshops on marketing, communication, advertising, and public relations for local businessmen; and to enhance New Mexico's industrial economy through consultations with community and business leaders.

Sixteen projects concentrated on the unemployment problem in 1968. Arizona State University's counseling service and on-the-job training for senior citizens in Phoenix is one example.

Projects focused on transportation and housing are few in number but appear to deal with significant issues. Illustrative projects are Iowa State University's consulting service for the home building industry on construction techniques and optimum land use and a workshop on housing for the elderly at the University of South Florida.

Project Goals

Information made available by the States was analyzed to determine the central purpose of all projects funded in 1968. While it is recognized that a project may have several objectives, major purpose may be classified in terms of (1) organizational change, (2) improvement of service, (3) managerial improvement and (4) individual improvement. (See Appendix, Table III)

Organizational Change: The central purpose of 91 projects was the influencing of major decision making processes. These projects ranged from the one in Georgia, where Brunswick Junior College and the University of Gerogia conducted a seminar on consolidating city and county governments to the one in New York where Rockefeller University professors and management personnel from New York City worked together to develop a comprehensive plan to re-structure some of the city's governmental units.

Improvement of Services: Three hundred and forty-seven institutional projects were directed toward achieving higher standards of individual performance in a variety of public-serving agencies. Among these projects are The University of Omaha's seminars on police-citizen communications and the University of Iowa's statewide program

for pharmacists, physicians, nurses, and administrators of health services. In Rhode Island, Salve Regina College conducted training seminars for teachers, social workers and volunteers serving in culturally deprived areas.

Managerial Improvement: Ninety-five projects were directed to managerial improvement. Some of the projects dealt with broad issues. Others were directed at specific problems such as urban education in Missouri involving both educational administrators and teachers. In Tennessee leadership laboratories were held for local government and civic leaders to aid in diagnosing and managing community problems.

Individual Improvement: One hundred and nineteen projects were designed to aid in the individual participant's personal development. The University of South Carolina, in cooperation with Vanderbilt University and Meharry Medical College, has developed a program on nutritional health improvement for preschool children of low income families in Beaufort County, South Carolina. Other examples of programs concentrating on individual improvement are Ohio State University's basic course for Negro businessmen in the initiation, development, and operation of small businesses; Wichita State University's special noncredit courses to aid adult women in beginning or continuing their university studies; and Wayne State University's program to provide consumer education to adult residents of inner-city Detroit. Sixty-seven projects had more complex objectives. The Urban Affairs and Community Service Center at North Carolina State University in combining counseling and referral services with related training and research functions provides a good illustration.

CONCLUSIONS

As land-grant colleges and universities in the past assisted in solving problems of agriculture, the Council observes that institutions of higher education of all types and sizes are now, under Title I, making significant contributions to the understanding and solution of diverse community problems. This Federal program has encouraged State and local officials to join with colleges, universities and community leaders in this expanded role. And institutions themselves have profited. They are finding broader acceptance of the university and increased financial support for community educational programs as well as improved curricula, more relevant instruction, and a better community image. Title I is also making steady progress in establishing groups of educators and State and local leaders in and out of government who are addressing themselves to developing and administering educational activities related to community problems.

A REVIEW

OF

FEDERALLY-SUPPORTED EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

The National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education was established by the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Section 109c). The major charge to the Council is to:

> "... review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs, including community service programs, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports. . . of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title and other Federal laws relating to extension and continuing education activities) to the Secretary and to the President."

In continuing work on this assignment the Council has obtained information from a number of sources both public and private. During the course of its deliberations, the Council made use of the reports of other advisory groups and of Federal agencies that were relevant to its concerns.

The Council has deliberated as a body to assess the facts available and to arrive at its recommendations. The recommendations contained in this report therefore reflect the best judgement of the members of the Council.

REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION AND EFFECTIVENESS

The Council's responsibility is the evaluation of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs (including community service programs) involving higher education.

The lack of staff and funds has delayed the accomplishment of this mission. Prior studies conducted for the Council setting forth tentative appraisal criteria and systems of problem identification are being held in abeyance until resources are available to carry out the long-range plan of the Council.

After reviewing its prior recommendations, the Council re-states its findings relative to the timing of Federal appropriations and the differing approaches to indirect cost reimbursement.

The pattern of legislative action on appropriations is a deterrent to successful program planning and operation at both the state and institutional levels. The initiation of projects, the availability of personnel and the provision of matching funds late in the fiscal year are out of phase with the realities of institutional planning and resource allocation. To aid in the development of more effective programs and to secure continuing institutional commitment, the Council urges the Congress to appropriate funds prior to the year in which they are to be used.

A continuing problem in the State administration of Federal programs is the complexity of financial management. Different formulas are used to establish overhead or indirect cost rates and the same formulas are interpreted differently by the several Federal agencies. The Council's fifth recommendation suggests that a consistent policy for the several programs would result in the more efficient use of Federal funds for extension and continuing education efforts.

A committee of Federal representatives to the Council was formed in December 1968. Individuals from ten Federal agencies have participated in committee discussions. It is believed that this committee has brought about increased cooperation and collaboration among the Federal agencies concerned with varied programs of extension and continuing education.

The deliberations of the committee identified some of the issues that must be dealt with in the continuing work of the Council:

1. The lack of a recognizable Federal focus or commitment in the area of extension and continuing education whereby departmental or agency programs can be assessed in terms of national needs or goals.

2. The need for a commonly accepted definition of extension and continuing education which includes the variety of support mechanisms presently in use by the various agencies.

3. The need for a national clearinghouse to collect and disseminate information on programs and approaches for the improvement of continuing education within the varied institutions and agencies concerned with human resource development and community problem solving.

THE FEDERAL ROLE IN CONTINUING EDUCATION

While the Council is aware that most colleges and universities engage in some form of continuing education activities for adults, data have not been available on the type and extent of such programs.

The National Center for Educational Statistics in the Office of Education is completing a survey of "Selected Adult Education Activities in Institutions of Higher Education". This survey will provide, for the first time, a determination of the community service and continuing education activities and estimates of the volume of these activities. The study will also indicate which activities have some measure of Federal financial support. The results of the survey will be made available to the Council at an early date and should provide valuable data on the scope of activities across the broad spectrum of higher education institutions.

National data on individual participation in adult or continuing education has been recognized as one of the largest gaps in information gathering and dissemination about American education. Basic data are necessary before the problems and prospects of Federal support can be adequately assessed. The Office of Education in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census is undertaking a "National Adult Education Survey." Pre-tests of the survey have been completed and the questionnaire is expected to be included in the May 1969 Current Population Survey. Analysis of this data would contribute new knowledge about participants in Federal programs related to the solution of community problems.

The Library of Congress has recently completed (December 1968) a survey of Federal Educational Policies, Programs and Proposals. This description of more than 700 Federal programs of education, training and research provides basic information that could be used for the classification and analysis of all Federal efforts in the continuing education of adults.

The Council has agreed to review first those Federal programs that support higher education services either by direct grants to the states and individual institutions or by contracts for services. The Council would then move to an assessment of total federal continuing education support and its impact on national problems.

CONCLUSION

The Council is prepared, with the addition of appropriate resources, to meet its assigned responsibilities. The dynamic nature of community problems and the complexity of federal programs to alleviate these problems demand a high priority of attention in each branch of the Federal Government.

The Council proposes to implement its plan to:

- Identify problems which are amenable to university action;
- Establish priorities for Federal support;
- Assess the effectiveness of present Federal efforts in community problem solving;
- Identify needs that are not being met; and
- Suggest administrative and legislative action.

A P P E N D I X

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS BY TYPE OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTION
FISCAL YEAR 1968

Type of Institution	Number	Percentage	Federal* Funds	Percentage
Land Grant and State Universities	85	21	$ 4,526.6	51.7
Four-Year Public Institutions	138	34	1,935.8	22.1
Four-Year Private Institutions	120	30	1,711.1	19.5
Two-Year Public Institutions	53	13	538.9	6.1
Two-Year Private Institutions	8	2	48.4	0.6
TOTALS	404	100	$ 8,760.8	100.0

* in thousands of dollars

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF PROJECTS AND FEDERAL FUNDS BY TYPE OF GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED FISCAL YEAR 1968

Area Served	Number of Programs	Percentage	Federal* Funds	Percentage
Urban	376	52	4.8	54.5
Urban/Suburban	95	14	1.1	12.5
Rural	59	8	.7	8.0
Comprehensive	189	26	2.2	25.0
TOTALS	719	100	8.8	100

* in millions of dollars

TABLE III

COMPARATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF PROGRAMS
IN COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION BY PROGRAM PURPOSE
1967 AND 1968

Purpose	1968 (Number)	1967 (Number)	Percentage Change
Organizational Change	91	160	-14%
Improvement of Services	347	248	+ 7%
Managerial Improvement	95	92	- 2%
Individual Improvement	119	61	+ 7%
Multi-Purpose	67	34	+ 3%
Unclassifiable	-	7	- 1%
TOTALS	719	602	- -

TABLE IV
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

P.L. 89-329, Title I
Higher Education Act of 1965

COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS
Fiscal Year 1968 State Allotment[1]

U.S. and Outlying Areas	$10,000,000
50 States and the District of Columbia	$ 9,832,284

Alabama	185,126	New Mexico	124,761
Alaska	106,520	New York	542,140
Arizona	138,461	North Carolina	220,510
Arkansas	147,398	North Dakota	115,922
California	549,393	Ohio	350,080
Colorado	157,594	Oklahoma	159,779
Connecticut	169,107	Oregon	147,325
Delaware	112,283	Pennsylvania	382,852
Florida	241,536	Rhode Island	121,758
Georgia	207,226	South Carolina	162,270
Hawaii	117,338	South Dakota	116,752
Idaho	116,923	Tennessee	194,015
Illinois	359,848	Texas	358,627
Indiana	219,485	Utah	124,273
Iowa	167,349	Vermont	109,865
Kansas	154,895	Virginia	207,934
Kentucky	177,483	Washington	172,599
Louisiana	186,934	West Virginia	144,321
Maine	124,078	Wisconsin	201,097
Maryland	186,299	Wyoming	108,058
Massachusetts	230,913	District of Columbia	119,584
Michigan	303,097		
Minnesota	186,982		
Mississippi	156,385		
Missouri	209,693	Outlying Areas:	
Montana	117,167	American Samoa	25,513
Nebraska	135,628	Guam	26,856
Nevada	110,598	Puerto Rico	89,297
New Hampshire	116,434	Virgin Islands	26,050
New Jersey	265,589		

[1]Distribution of $10,000,000 with a basic allotment of $100,000 to the 50 States and D.C., $25,000 to the outlying areas, and the balance distributed on the basis of the estimated total resident population at 7/1/65.

NOTE: These allotments were identical to those for Fiscal Year 1967.

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP BY STATE
FY 1968

	Number of Members		Number of Members
Alabama - 1	28	Nebraska - 1	12
Alaska - 1	7	Nevada - 2	16
Arizona - 1	25	New Hampshire - 1	6
Arkansas - 1	20	New Jersey - 1	15
California - 2	18	New Mexico - 1	17
Colorado - 2	13	New York - 1	18
Connecticut - 2	-	North Carolina - 1	10
Delaware - 2	4	North Dakota - 2	-
District of Columbia - 1	15	Ohio - 1	11
Florida - 1	7	Oklahoma - 1	14
Georgia - 1	23	Oregon - 1	8
Hawaii - 1	9	Pennsylvania - 1	17
Idaho - 1	7	Rhode Island - 2	6
Illinois - 2	20	South Carolina - 1	5
Indiana--Not Participating	-	South Dakota - 2	-
Iowa - 1	17	Tennessee - 1	22
Kansas - 1	7	Texas - 2	21
Kentucky - 1	22	Utah - 1	14
Louisiana - 2	-	Vermont - 1	7
Maine - 1	10	Virginia - 1	12
Maryland - 1	9	Washington - 2	7
Massachusetts - 1	17	West Virginia - 1	10
Michigan - 1	19	Wisconsin - 1	12
Minnesota - 2	29	Wyoming - 2	30
Mississippi - 2	15	Guam - 2	-
Missouri - 1	19	Puerto Rico - 1	8
Montana - 1	13	Virgin Islands - 1	5

TOTAL 676

1-Advisory Council required for designated State Agency to meet the qualifications in Sec. 105(2) of the Act (Public Law 89-329).

2-Advisory Council not required to meet qualifications referenced in footnote above

TABLE VI

COMPARISON BY STATE OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS
COOPERATING IN COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS
FY 1968

	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	TOTAL
Alabama	27	10	37
Alaska	8	3	11
Arizona	25	16	41
Arkansas	26	17	43
California	155	96	251
Colorado	17	3	20
Connecticut	15	12	27
Delaware	20	21	41
District of Columbia	12	9	21
Florida	53	28	81
Georgia	52	20	72
Hawaii	27	1	28
Idaho	42	19	61
Illinois	27	26	53
Indiana	Not Participating		
Iowa	24	38	62
Kansas	25	13	38
Kentucky	16	10	26
Louisiana	32	8	40
Maine	27	17	44
Maryland	37	23	60
Massachusetts	38	7	45
Michigan	10	14	24
Minnesota	12	4	16
Mississippi	1	3	4
Missouri	40	15	55
Montana	43	23	66
Nebraska	14	6	20
Nevada	7	4	11
New Hampshire	14	17	31
New Jersey	20	12	32
New Mexico	6	9	15
New York	84	19	103
North Carolina	31	16	47
North Dakota	14	12	26
Ohio	31	28	59
Oklahoma	48	18	66
Oregon	22	18	40
Pennsylvania	82	44	126
Rhode Island	9	17	26
South Carolina	13	13	26
South Dakota	27	24	51
Tennessee	60	25	85
Texas	67	15	82
Utah	19	11	30
Vermont	22	14	36
Virginia	57	31	88
Washington	36	21	57
West Virginia	43	35	78
Wisconsin	17	17	34
Wyoming	9	3	12
Guam	Not Reported		
Puerto Rico	3	6	9
Virgin Islands	15	0	15
TOTALS	1581	891	2472

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF EXPENDITURES FOR
COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS
BY PROBLEM AREA, FISCAL YEAR 1968

Problem Area	Number of Programs	Federal Funds	Local Funds	Total Funds
Government	227	$2,462,404	$2,505,534	$4,967,938
Housing	5	65,381	65,381	103,762
Poverty	25	390,324	409,213	799,537
Transportation	7	68,655	145,630	214,285
Land Use	43	471,832	523,343	995,175
Youth Opportunities	43	483,742	515,879	999,621
Recreation	37	329,326	353,743	683,069
Employment	16	226,716	303,111	529,827
Health	60	516,659	526,982	1,043,641
Community Development	173	2,763,130	2,943,518	5,706,648
Economic Development	17	221,585	221,645	443,230
Human Relations	31	297,281	314,273	611,554
Personal Development	35	481,050	515,467	996,517
	719	$8,778,085	$9,343,719	$18,121,804*

* Does not include administrative expenditures of the State Agencies.

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF STATE PROGRAMS BY CENTRAL PURPOSE
OF INSTITUTIONAL PROJECTS N-719
FY 1968

TOTALS	Individual Improvement	Organizat'l Change	Improvement of Services	Managerial Improvement	Multi-Purpose
Alabama	2	1	6	0	1
Alaska	1	0	1	0	0
Arizona	1	2	6		0
Arkansas	15	1	1	)	0
California	6	5	8	1	1
Colorado	0	0	3	4	0
Connecticut	5	2	5	0	0
Delaware	1	0	6	0	0
District of Columbia	0	5	3	2	0
Florida	10	2	5	2	0
Georgia	2	6	24	8	0
Hawaii	3	2	2	1	0
Idaho	0	2	9	0	0
Illinois	1	5	9	3	0
Indiana		Not Participating			
Iowa	4	1	21	9	0
Kansas	1	3	4	2	0
Kentucky	2	1	9	2	0
Louisiana	1	2	9	2	0
Maine	4	1	8	2	0
Maryland	0	6	8	0	2
Massachusetts	0	2	7	0	2
Michigan	3	5	5	1	0
Minnesota	1	2	3	1	1
Mississippi	0	0	1	2	0
Missouri	0	0	10	5	1
Montana	5	10	3	0	1
Nebraska	1	0	6	0	1
Nevada	3	0	4	0	0
New Hampshire	2	1	7	1	1
New Jersey	1	4	4	0	3
New Mexico	0	0	0	0	4
New York	3	3	5	4	3
North Carolina	5	0	11	4	4
North Dakota	2	0	0	1	3
Ohio	3	0	12	10	3
Oklahoma	3	0	4	4	1
Oregon	0	1	3	0	2
Pennsylvania	2	5	16	4	7
Rhode Island	5	0	8	0	0
South Carolina	2	0	1	0	3
South Dakota	0	0	7	1	3
Tennessee	1	2	11	1	3
Texas	0	1	10	4	2
Utah	1	1	0	2	4
Vermont	1	0	8	1	1
Virginia	2	1	26	2	3
Washington	4	1	7	2	1
West Virginia	8	2	11	3	0
Wisconsin	1	1	6	1	4
Wyoming	1	0	1	1	0
Guam		Not Reported			
Puerto Rico	0	1	1	0	2
Virgin Islands	0	1	1	1	0
TOTALS	119	91	347	95	67

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1969 344-645 (2100)